

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

SUZANNE M. SEARLES,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	Case No. 2:90cv0626 (PCD)
WEST HARTFORD BOARD OF	:	Case No. 3:97cv2601 (PCD)
EDUCATION, PAUL BERKEL,	:	Case No. 3:00cv1115 (PCD)
NATALIE SCHULMAN, MATTHEW	:	
BORRELLI, PETER RELIC, LLOYD	:	
CALVERT, JAMES J. MOORE,	:	December 20, 2006
EDWARD J. FREDERICKS, M.D.,	:	
JAMES BLACK, M. PETER BLUM,	:	
NEIL MACY, and WILLIAM DOLAN,	:	
Defendants.	:	

**RULING ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
AND INDEPENDENT ACTION**

\_\_\_\_\_ On May 1, 2006, this Court denied Plaintiff’s motions to reopen her case, appoint counsel, and proceed in forma pauperis. On May 22, 2006, Plaintiff filed motions for reconsideration and for independent action in these three related cases, Case Numbers 2:90cv0626 (PCD) [Doc. No. 182], 3:97cv2601 (PCD) [Doc. No. 40], and 3:00cv1115 (PCD) [Doc. No. 91], on May 22, 2006. For the reasons that follow, Plaintiff’s motions for reconsideration are **denied**.

These cases date back to 1990 and have been fully litigated in this Court. All three cases were closed years ago. See Searles v. Bd. of Ed., et al., 3:00cv1115 (PCD) (closed since May, 2001 when the Second Circuit issued a mandate dismissing Plaintiff’s appeal) [Doc. No. 73]; Searles v. West Hartford Bd. of Ed., 3:97cv2501 (PCD) (closed since May, 1999 when the Second Circuit issued a mandate dismissing Plaintiff’s appeal) [Doc. No. 23]; Searles v. Relic, et al., 2:90cv0626 (PCD) (closed since May, 1997 when the Second Circuit issued a mandate

dismissing Plaintiff's appeal) [Doc. No. 164]. In August, 2005, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed Plaintiff's subsequent appeal. Despite warnings from both this Court and the Second Circuit against future frivolous filings, see Searles v. Bd. of Ed., 3:00cv11115 (PCD), Mandate [Doc. No. 81] (Plaintiff "is prohibited from filing any further motions, appeals, or other papers in this Court with respect to the facts, claims, or issues underlying [these appeals] ... without first obtaining leave of this Court."); Searles v. West Hartford Bd. of Ed., 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17731, No. 3:97cv2601 (PCD) (D. Conn. Nov. 27, 2000) ("[S]hould plaintiff initiate litigation against any of these defendants again regarding the facts and circumstances of this case, without prior judicial authorization, sanctions may be imposed."), Plaintiff filed motions to reopen her cases, to appoint counsel, and to proceed in forma pauperis in January, 2006. After these motions were denied, Plaintiff filed this motion for reconsideration. However, Plaintiff neither raises new points of law or alleges the availability of new evidence which would warrant this Court's reconsideration of her January, 2006 motions. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is **denied**. Plaintiff is strongly advised to consider this Court's warning of sanctions before filing any further documents in support of relitigating the issues in these cases, all of which have been fully litigated and closed.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at New Haven, this 20th day of December, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Peter C. Dorsey  
United States District Judge